

March 6, 1975

in the rules, that I am aware of, that says that you cannot debate a proposal to reconsider. You certainly can't apply a rule, way back, applying to Final Reading, to a motion to reconsider. You strap the guy who wants to reconsider if you do not provide to the members of the Legislature what new information . . . that is what he has, or the merits of the legislation. Because it's only on the merits you reconsider.

PRESIDENT: The ruling does apply to Final Reading. There are many many matters considered by this body upon which votes are taken and those matters are debatable and they are subject to motions to reconsider. Those motions to reconsider, in most instances, are debatable. If the motion prevails than the subject matter is also debatable. There is no specific rule for nor against this. The Chair is satisfied from its research that if the matter itself is not debatable then a motion to reconsider that matter is also not debatable. One of the reasons we do not debate on Final Reading is because people are supposed to have enough information, at that time, that further debate would be useless and time consuming. The Chair's ruling then, in effect, would be to cut off an avenue whereby further debate could be had improperly on a bill on Final Reading, because at any instance a person who wants to debate on Final Reading then could vote contrary to his convictions simply to debate the bill further. That is not Senator Chambers purpose in this instance, I don't believe. It could be a very valuable technique to cause debate on Final Reading, simply by using it. That is not the instance here because Senator Chambers, at the time the vote was taken, genuinely announced that he wanted it reconsidered. That technique cannot be used to circumvent the rules of no debate on Final Reading. It is on the basis of this that the Chair asked that you sustain it. The question is shall the Chair be sustained in its ruling prohibiting debate on a motion to reconsider when the matter itself is not debatable. Record your vote. Record Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 6 ayes, 27 nays.

PRESIDENT: The Chair is not sustained. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Is it in order to discuss the motion?

PRESIDENT: It isn't, but I've been overruled.

SENATOR WARNER: As far as out here it's OK?

PRESIDENT: After appealing you get licked, you smile and go ahead.

SENATOR WARNER: OK. Well, Mr. President and members of the body, just briefly . . . and I can appreciate the purpose that the city of Omaha and Senator Cavanaugh wishes to accomplish. There are two or three things that concerns me about this bill, as well as a couple of others. Inevitably when you create to accomplish a social gain through a tax system, inevitably you're going to bring in some circumstances that you do not intend to bring, but there is no way that you can write